

Component 1: Plan the Implementation Approach

- A. Develop and adopt a systematic and comprehensive strategy to implement agricultural nonpoint source pollution control standards and prohibitions under NR 151. To be consistent with this statewide program, the local strategy should describe the methodology to be used for carrying out activities under components three through ten (below) including:
- Conducting information and education activities;
 - Systematically selecting and evaluating parcels for compliance with standards and prohibitions;
 - Documenting and reporting compliance status;
 - Providing or arranging for the provision of technical assistance;
 - Making cost sharing available as needed to install or implement BMP's;
 - Issuing required notices and conducting enforcement activities;
 - Tracking and reporting program activities and progress; and
 - Monitoring compliance

Notes:

1. For counties choosing to implement this component, the strategy must a) be defined in the county Land and Water Plan per ATCP 50.12(2)(l), Wis. Administrative Code, and b) ensure that compliance with the standards and prohibitions is achieved, per § 92.10(6)(a) 5 Wis. Stats. and ATCP 50.12(2)(i) Wis. Admin. Code.
2. The systematic selection of parcels will ensure that a prescribed amount of evaluations will regularly occur (e.g. annually). This will, in turn, ensure that realistic projections concerning timeframes and needed financial resources can be made and routinely updated on a statewide basis. In order to be systematic, a strategy for selecting and evaluating parcels and subsequently implementing standards does not rely only on voluntary participation.

Question 1: Will your County outline a systematic and comprehensive implementation strategy and incorporate it into your LWRM Plan?

35 Yes	3 No	24 Unsure
--------	------	-----------

County	If No or Unsure, Please Describe Why.
Ashland, Bayfield, Douglas, Iron	Parcel data not available. Farm conservation info may not be updated or in usable format.
Brown	Brown County will implement state standards that are consistent with existing County Ordinances: Animal Waste Management, Agriculture Shore land Management, Floodplains and Shore lands ordinance provisions related to Buffer Strips. All other work needed to conform to state standards will be conditional upon receiving staff funding from State of Wisconsin unless it is located in an active Priority Watershed Project (with staffing and cost share provided by state) and is an eligible practice.
Buffalo	The steps Buffalo County will take to implement NR151 will definitely be incorporated into our LWRM plan. Outlining a systematic and comprehensive implementation strategy makes me believe you are expecting the counties to stop what they are doing in the means of conservation to implement NR 151. In the last 10 years Buffalo County has had 257,536 thousand acres of its overall 448,364 county acres involved in two state priority watershed programs and one federal EQIP Project. Substantial inventory and practice work has been completed in these three watersheds of the county. We are currently working with landowners in another three sub-watersheds of Buffalo County and have been awarded TRM Grant, cost share funds to work in other critical areas of the county. Landowners of the county call daily with conservation questions about cost share funds, their conservation farm plan and just general questions about completing structural practice work with or without cost share funds. Buffalo County would like to continue to provide the landowners of the county the services we have been providing them in the past, and just go one step farther to complete a check of compliance with NR 151 on the site visits we make with our landowners.

Calumet	(Answered Yes) Our next Plan update is tentatively scheduled for 2006. Our strategy will be systematic and incorporated in Plan, but may or not include all elements of or extent of the methodology listed under components three to ten below. In 2005, when we are beginning the revision of our Plan, we will have a better idea of what implementation activities we can undertake and what our strategies really are. They may not be the same as those listed in this document.
Clark	LWRM Plan will not be revised until 2006.
Dane	(Answered "Yes" and "Unsure"; counted as "Unsure" based on comments) We plan to operate within our means and capabilities and priorities
Eau Claire	Depends on what the state considers 'systematic' and 'comprehensive' vs. what the county considers for the same + what funding is available for the county to do this. Also depends upon a phased in approach.
Fond du Lac	Our LWRM plan revision date is Aug. 2007. At that time it will depend on available staff, cost sharing, and the existing workload. We do support the concept.
Green	Depends on staff. We only have 3 staff now and there is a county hiring freeze. The 3 of us are more than maxed out on workload. We turn away jobs.
Green Lake	(Answered Yes) We are working on some strategies at the moment to implement this. We are hoping to use our GIS to do this.
Iowa	(Answered Yes) We expect our LWRM plan to include an implementation strategy by 2005 (e-file and hard copy comments the same)
Kenosha	Unsure at this time. Kenosha County has requested a 3-year extension to its scheduled LWRM plan revision deadline. That extension request is pending before the LWBC. Kenosha County therefore has not outlined the content of its revised LWRM plan.
Lafayette	We would do our best.
Langlade	(Did not answer, but comments suggest "No") Something the county can't do because of lack of funding and staff.
Marathon	(Answered Yes) We are waiting for DATCP workgroup plan guidelines. Our plan is scheduled to be revised by Feb 2005. Because of staff availability we will probably taking a slow systematic approach
Marinette	I am not sure what is meant by "systematic and comprehensive." Currently we are kept very busy working with the landowners that come forward voluntarily and want to install BMP's. Compliance checking and prioritizing every farmer in the county would mean a halt in installations of BMP's for at least a full year. We only have one agricultural focused technician. We cannot force participation without much greater financial resources, especially for cropland practices. Working with willing farmers has allowed us to provide less than 70% cost sharing in many cases. There is not enough bonding money available to reach the 70% cost sharing level needed to force implementation of BMP's. In our County your strategy will mean a large net loss in conservation on the land.
Marquette	(Answered Yes) We support implementation and would do what we could. We do not have the staff to implement it right now.
Menominee	No need for ag performance standards in Menominee County. Ag classification is less than 300 acres county-wide. There was a 0% soil erosion rate of ag land use according to a 1999 update by the Census of Agriculture. There has been no significant changes since then.
Monroe	At this point I am not willing to commit to a prescribed amount of evaluations. There are too many questions on the standards and prohibitions, and there are too many questions on local staff time. At this point we have plenty of local priorities for our small staff. Our county is currently considering giving us other responsibilities. I believe there are parts of this component 1 that we will do and parts we will not.
Outagamie	We are still unsure of the need for a detailed strategy to be in our LWRM plan. We do not even know the details of what we may have to do. We are concerned with funding/staffing issues, with time lines to reach accomplishments and with ramifications if the county writes this into our plan.

Price	We are only able to assist with those that want to implement practices. We have no time, money, job approval rating. NRCS can do it along with the farm planning. (e-file) Generally, Price County lacks staff, money, and enough job approval to do a lot of things. Our plates are full, and it seems that this inverted pyramid of oversight/management is costing the taxpayers way too much. This whole thing is about control, from above and hoping our little LCDs can support all the overhead with actual implementation of practices. You know, I believe LCDs should run the show and tell you folks what WE want from you to make things go. It might be a real epiphany to have things controlled by those actually doing the work. (hard copy)
Racine	Will work on it but due to a small staff of two, it may take some time.
Rusk	Unsure: Because the consequences for outlining a strategy and then not implementing that strategy are not known.
St. Croix	This will require more discussion with our Land and Water Conservation Committee. We are beginning the process of amending our Resource Management Plan. The implementation Strategy component will need to be discussed with both our citizen advisory and technical advisory committee before we make any commitment to they type of strategy to employ. The department is committed to completing the current watersheds programs within our county. This should be a priority for our department
Taylor	Our original Land and Water Resource Management Plan (LWRMP) was developed with a substantial amount of public input and involvement through a Citizens Advisory Committee and a Technical Work Group. Since we currently have not started the process of revising our LWRMP, it is premature to determine if outlining a systematic and comprehensive implementation strategy for NR-151 will be a high priority.
Trempealeau	DATCP designed the lwrmp plans to be punitive tools to be used against the county's which are too aggressive in the enforcement of the states performance standards and prohibitions. To avoid unnecessary conflict, the county shall only include in the lwrmp plan what the county is statutorily required to include. Preference would be to enter into an agreement with DNR and remain silent in the lwrmp plan. The preference would be to limit any future interaction between the DATCP and the lcd
Vernon	I would probably say yes, but the proposal has not yet been by my committee yet. They are aware of the Nonpoint rules but, have not been presented with an implementation plan
Vilas	We have small amounts of cropland and the magnitude and extent of cropland erosion in Vilas County is small.
Walworth	(Answered Yes on both hard copy submissions. In our workplan (1 st hard copy); in the plan – (2 nd hard copy)
Washburn	(Answered Yes) LWRMP not being revised until spring of '05.
Waukesha	(Answered Yes) <u>Note</u> : The LWRM plan will not contain all the details, but it should have an "outline" of the main points in the strategy. The LWRM plan is scheduled to be updated in 2005.
Waupaca	(Answered Yes) The timeline is the question---we will include the strategy in the plan but implementation is in the future.
Wood	We most likely will do this

* Grant County: Hard Copy and e-file submissions are different; Only e-file tallied; Yes indicated on hard copy, No on e-file

LaCrosse Co.: No submission. New country structure; uncertain how will proceed

Lincoln Co.: No submission, but sent letter. Does not want to commit without additional information about state commitment and funding.

Menomonee Co.: Does not see need for ag performance standards (300 ac. classified as ag use; 0% soil erosion rate.

Pierce Co.: No submission, but sent letter. LCC not able to commit to implementation activities but willing to discuss future role.